

MAR 25 2011

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 to 10 and 14, all other claims being cancelled. Claim 2 has been cancelled since claim 1 already contains this feature and claims 1 and 3 have been amended to return to the original terminology with respect to the flexible seal engaging the sealing disk. No new drawing is required in view of the amendment to claims 1 and 3 and overcomes the rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

With respect to the drawings, it is believed that the drawings show every feature since the claims are no longer directed to "a sealing disk engaging a sealing disk".

All the claims stand rejected as being obvious under 35 USC 103 over the Ishiguro reference taken in view of the Irwin patent. The Examiner states that Applicants are arguing limitations not in the claims.

Applicants traverse this ground of rejection since the prior art does not render obvious Applicants' invention. It is believed that the amended claims point out Applicants' invention so as to distinguish from the cited art. The present invention is directed to a bead (24) on the first


sealing lip by which a movement of the center of mass initiators appears which center of mass initiates in the installed position is arranged shifted to the sealing moves to a supporting line arranged which is determined by the sealing disk.

The draught causes a diminished start of the sealing lip with rising spread. Consequently, the friction power of the sealing decreases which arrangement is described in paragraph 6 of the printed application. In contrast to Applicants' invention, the Ishiguro patent shows a seal with a first sealing lip which is supported on a wall of a recess. A second sealing lip is aligned perpendicular to the first sealing lip and is not inclined into the recess.

The Irwin patent shows only a single seal with an axially oriented sealing lip and the additional mass embedded in the sealing lip causes a complete lifting of the sealing lip of the contact area when in operation so the seal completely loses its sealing effect. The lip of Applicants' invention is arranged radially. Therefore, the combination of the cited art does not teach Applicants' invention and therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims point out Applicants' invention. Therefore, favorable reconsideration of the invention is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles A. Muserlian #19,683
Attorney for Applicants
Tel. 845 268 2462

CAM:mlp
Enclosures